

have been trustees during both the Bush and Clinton administrations. They are nonpolitical, private citizens charged with working in the best interests of senior citizens and our country. Most important, they do not answer to the White House.

In the past, Mr. Ross and Mr. Walker have issued their own statements. Believe it or not, the trustees issued a report and the citizen members issue their own report in the back of the book because they do not agree with the public members.

So, what do they have to say? I want to read some of these two public trustees' statements into the RECORD.

The Medicare program is clearly unsustainable in its present form.

Further quote:

With the results of last Congress, it is now clear that Medicare reform needs to be addressed urgently as a distinct legislative initiative.

Continuing the quote:

The idea that reductions in Medicare expenditures should be available for other purposes, including even other health care purposes, is mistaken.

Why do I quote that? I will tell you a little more about that in a moment. Continuing on:

The focus should be on making Medicare itself sustainable, making it compatible with Social Security, and making both [of them] financially sound in the long term.

That is the end the quotes. Now, my own conclusions from that.

That is what public, nonpolitical trustees say we should do about Medicare and that is exactly what I hope we are going to do. I would be quick to add, as Senator CHAFEE has pointed out, when Congress increased taxes on Social Security benefits in 1993, it devoted the increased revenues to this HI trust fund. Therefore there should be no doubt, if we now repeal that increase we would be lowering the amount of money going into this HI fund, causing the system to go bankrupt even sooner.

We must enact comprehensive Medicare reform to make Medicare financially sound now. And we must do that so it will be manageable and sound over the long term. We must make it sustainable and do that now. We must act to preserve the system, to ensure that our senior citizens receive Medicare today and will continue to receive it in 7 years from now. There is nothing magical about it. We have to do something. If we do not do anything it will be bankrupt. Current seniors for the next 5 or 6 years will get their hospital bill paid as per the law, but thereafter they will not.

What kind of public servants and leaders are we, if we do nothing again? So I am committing today that the U.S. Senate Budget Committee is going to mark up a budget resolution. After we return from this recess that will get done. At least from my standpoint, as chairman, I commit to a blueprint that not only achieves balance in terms of our fiscal house, but also addresses this

critical problem. In order to make Medicare financially sound and a financially sound program once again, Congress will have to follow.

I made a comment that I did not follow up on, where I said the nonpolitical trustees, the two who are not Members of the President's Cabinet, said that Medicare savings should be used—Senator GORTON—to make the program solvent. Not to pay for something else.

One might say, "Who intends to spend them for something else? What are you talking about?" I suggest the President ought to let us know what he has in mind. He proposed a \$130 billion in Medicare savings 2 years ago. He did not help with this, not one bit. Because he spent the money. He spent it to cover other people with health care coverage problems. I submit that one of the reasons the President of the United States did not put Medicare reform in his budget is because he intends to use Medicare reform savings to pay for health care reform, not to put it on the deficit. I submit we ought to have that debate.

We ought to ask the American people: Do you want to make this program solvent as it should be, or do you want to take savings that you can get from reform and decide we are so rich we can just spend it on another program? That is simple and that is oversimplification, but it is the real question. Some will say, Senator DOMENICI, it is not that simple. We need to cover all the other people who are not covered and it will ultimately help this program. But to tell you the truth, that is very, very difficult to understand. It is very difficult to figure we are really going to do that someday.

So I submit in the next 6 months this body, the U.S. Senate, has a real chance to vote on whether they are going to make this program for future senior citizens and those who have been paying into this fund for a long time, this 2.9 percent—for those, are we going to make it solvent or not? I believe there is a way to do it without a huge amount of pain. I might just suggest it is amazing that the two programs, big programs in health care that are still on a hell-bent-for-bankruptcy growth line are the two programs the U.S. Federal Government still runs.

There are no other programs that are growing at 10 percent a year. Go ask businesses, are they paying 10 percent more, year after year, for insurance coverage for their employees? They will tell you no. It was 14 percent or 15 percent 3 years ago, but it is down to 4 and 5 in some cases. In fact, we got a report the other day, some of them that were growing at 12 or 13 percent are now down at no growth, getting the same coverage. Why? Because they are trying new delivery systems. They are trying managed care. They are trying health maintenance organizations. They are trying those kinds of delivery systems which everybody knows are inevitable.

But we hang onto Medicare and we lead our senior citizens to believe that they are only going to get good health care if we keep the system that the rest of the public is beginning to say does not work, it is too expensive. So that is why we can fix this and we can fix it without denying our senior citizens good, solid health care. And the programs must continue to grow because we know health care for seniors cannot be a zero sum game.

So I thought we ought to tie in, today, sort of the first presentation of the issue with reference to fiscal policy. If you do not want to fix this you probably do not want a balanced budget and, more important than anything else, you probably do not want to do anything very difficult to get to a balanced budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I may proceed as in mornings business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TURKEY MUST WITHDRAW

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on March 23, together with Senators KERRY, FEINGOLD, and SNOWE, I submitted Senate Resolution 91 condemning the Turkish invasion of Northern Iraq. Since then, Senators BIDEN, D'AMATO, SARBANES, and SIMON have become cosponsors. With such strong bipartisan support, I hoped to move this resolution to Senate passage. Until today, I had intended to offer it as an amendment to the pending legislation. Given the fluidity of the floor situation—particularly the difficulties involving the Jordan debt amendment, and the need to send that matter to the President as soon as possible—I think it best not to offer a foreign policy amendment to this bill.

I remain deeply concerned, however, about Turkey's continued military operations in northern Iraq, and I wish to address that subject now. In the past several days, I have had occasion to pursue this issue at the highest levels of both the United States and Turkish Governments. I have had an exchange of letters with both the President and the Secretary of State, and just this morning, I and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee met with the Turkish Foreign Minister.

Specifically, I am disturbed by Turkey's continued military presence in Iraqi Kurdistan, and by the Government's unwillingness to set a date certain for withdrawal. Turkey should withdraw now.

While I appreciate Turkey's legitimate desire to combat the terrorist threat posed by the PKK, I believe the military action in Northern Iraq goes beyond mere self-defense, and furthermore offers virtually no prospect of eradicating PKK terror. The vast majority of terrorist attacks in Turkey

are carried out not from Northern Iraq, but from inside Turkey itself. Turkey's repressive treatment of its own Kurds has forced thousands of civilian Kurds to flee to Northern Iraq. This has made it easier, in fact, for a small number of PKK terrorists to use civilian settlements in Northern Iraq as cover.

The Turkish incursion puts at risk thousands of Kurdish civilians living in Northern Iraq. To my mind, the Turkish incursion is a violation of international law, that must be brought to an end.

Furthermore, reports indicate that Turkey has made difficult access to areas of the conflict to representatives of international relief organizations, such as the International Red Cross. At a minimum, Turkey should take immediate steps to ensure the protection of innocent civilians and refugees. It also appears that Turkey has restricted journalists' access to critical areas of the conflict.

I must say that I took small comfort in the thought that Turkey is arranging tours for journalists and that it must place limits on access to the ICRC to ensure that the PKK does not receive assistance. I believe that the ICRC has vast experience in these matters, and certainly is as capable as the Turkish Government in determining how best to assist civilians caught in the fighting.

I will say that in my consultations with the U.S. Government on these matters, I have been pleased to see an acknowledgment of—and a concerted effort to—address my concerns. The President has assured me that United States officials in Washington and Ankara are pressing Turkey daily to protect innocent civilians and to withdraw at the earliest possible date.

The Secretary of State acknowledges that Turkey has been denying access to journalists and nongovernmental organizations, and informs me that the United States is working at the highest levels to rectify this situation. I am pleased to learn that United States embassy officials are visiting Iraqi Kurdistan this very week, and that Secretary Talbott and Secretary Holbrooke will travel to Ankara where they will pursue our concerns. I await their reports anxiously.

I welcome the apparent shift in the administration's approach to the troubling aspects of the invasion. The administration seems much more willing to question Turkey's motives and behavior, and to confront Turkey on these troubling issues. Although I still intend to pursue adoption of my resolution at the earliest practical time, I do believe U.S. policy is moving in the right direction.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am glad that my distinguished colleague,

the Senator from New Mexico is still on the floor.

If I got the message of the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, it is that President Clinton is not doing anything while Medicare is going broke.

Mr. President, that is about as topsy-turvy as you can get it. The truth of the matter is that Presidents Reagan and Bush were the ones who did nothing while we spent ourselves blind. It was the Congress—Republicans and Democrats—who overwhelmingly voted for the Reagan tax cut in 1981. This particular Senator, Senator Mathias, and Senator BRADLEY were the only ones to vote against those tax cuts and also vote for the spending cuts. We were trying to hold the line and pay the bill.

At that particular time, we did not have hundred billion dollar deficits. We had suffered during the 1970's when the impact of the OPEC cartel sent our country into a recession. In response, we had an economic summit with President Ford, and eventually worked our way down to a \$57 billion deficit when President Reagan took office.

But after the Reagan tax cuts, we saw the first \$100 billion and the first \$200 billion deficit. Then, under President Bush, we saw the first \$300 billion deficit. Before he left town, if you didn't use the surpluses in the trust funds to mask the size of the deficit, the red ink rose to over \$400 billion.

So President Clinton did not cause this problem. What did he do about it? Very admirably, he came to town and put all his political cards on the table, saying that you cannot get on top of this deficit unless you control health care costs.

In his first budget as President recommended cuts in Medicare and Medicaid which the Senate adopted to the tune of \$63 billion. Every Republican voted against these cuts. The distinguished occupant of the chair was not here. He may have been over on the House side where we did not get a Republican vote either. In the Senate, the Vice President had to break the tie. The President then followed up with his health care package containing additional Medicare and Medicaid reductions that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN, labeled as "fantasy." At the time Republicans took great pride in attacking the President, but to his credit he stuck to his guns.

Mr. President, the purpose of my rising this afternoon is to remind my colleagues of that piece of history. If the chairman of the Budget Committee wants to stand on the floor of the Senate with a big chart showing the deficit going up, let us remember that President Clinton did not start that line up. We did, long before the gentleman from Little Rock, AR, even came to town. Indeed, before President Clinton arrived the line would be even steeper.

Against all of this criticism of the President for "taking a walk" or "wav-

ing the white flag," I want to get right to the heart of my rub with the chairman of the Budget Committee. I read: "accepts the President's proposed reductions in the Medicare program and indexes the current \$100 annual part B deductions for inflation. Total Medicare savings would reach \$80 billion over the next 5 years."

That is the chairman of the Budget Committee, outlining the "GOP Alternative Deficit Reduction and Tax Relief Plan," just last April.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP ALTERNATIVE: DEFICIT REDUCTION AND TAX RELIEF—SLASHING THE DEFICIT, CUTTING MIDDLE CLASS TAXES

The Republican Alternative Budget will reduce the deficit \$318 billion over the next five years—\$287 billion in policy savings and \$31 billion from interest savings. This is \$322 billion more in deficit reduction than the President proposes and \$303 billion more in deficit reduction than the House-passed resolution contains.

Moreover, the GOP alternative budget helps President Clinton achieve two of his most important campaign promises—to cut the deficit in half in four years and provide a middle-class tax cut. The GOP plan:

Reduces the deficit to \$99 billion in 1999. This is \$106 billion less than the 1999 deficit projected under the Clinton budget.

Even under this budget federal spending will continue to grow.

Total spending would increase from \$1.48 trillion in FY 1995 to more than \$1.7 trillion in FY 1999.

Medicare would grow by 7.8-percent a year rather than the projected 10.6-percent. Medicaid's growth would slow to 8.1-percent annually rather than the projected 12-percent a year growth.

It increases funding for President Clinton's defense request by the \$20 billion short-fall acknowledged by the Pentagon.

Provides promised tax relief to American families and small business:

Provides tax relief to middle-class families by providing a \$500 tax credit for each child in the household. The provision grants needed tax relief to the families of 52 million American children. The tax credit provides a typical family of four \$80 every month for family expenses and savings.

Restores deductibility for interest on student loans.

Indexes capital gains for inflation and allows for capital loss on principal residence.

Creates new incentives for family savings and investments through new IRA proposals that would allow penalty free withdrawals for first time homebuyers, educational and medical expenses.

Establishes new Individual Retirement Account for homemakers.

Extends R&E tax credit for one-year and provides for a one-year exclusion of employer provided educational assistance.

Adjusts depreciation schedules for inflation (neutral cost recovery).

Tax provisions result in total tax cut of \$88 billion over five years.

Fully funds the Senate Crime Bill Trust Fund, providing \$22 billion for anti-crime measures over the next five years. The Clinton budget does not. The House-passed budget does not. The Chairman's mark does not.

Accepts the President's proposed \$113 billion level in nondefense discretionary spending reductions and then secures additional

savings by freezing aggregate nondefense spending for five years.

Accepts the President's proposed reductions in the medicare program and indexes the current \$100 annual Part "B" deductible for inflation. Total medicare savings would reach \$80 billion over the next five years.

Achieves \$64 billion in medicaid savings over the next five years, by capping medicaid payments, reducing and freezing Disproportionate Share Hospital payments at their 1994 level.

Achieves additional savings through reform of our welfare system totaling \$33 billion over the next five years.

Repeals Davis-Bacon, reduces the number of political appointees, reduces overhead expenditures for university research, and achieves savings from a cap on civilian FTE's.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Now, Mr. President, what galls my friends on the other side of the aisle is that the President of the United States did not give them a ball to run with this year. They thought the President might want to be harassed again and would propose another multibillion-dollar plan. Why go through that act again? Instead, he understandably said, "If you have a better way to do it, you do it." But rather than doing it, they come here with the false representation that the President of the United States has done nothing about Medicare. In so doing, the Republicans are making a feeble attempt to justify the enormous Medicare cuts that will be part of the Republican plan.

But we have seen their record on preserving the Medicare Trust Fund. One of the major proposals in the Contract With America would repeal recent changes in Social Security and would result in bankrupting the Medicare trust fund. If there is any movement around town to really make sure that Medicare goes broke quicker than 2002, it is to be found in the Contract With America.

The pundits on the weekend programs need to tell the American people the truth, namely that the entire contract is eyewash. Like a hurricane, as we learned down home, you just have to let it blow on through.

When all fanfare and fireworks are over, it does not create one single job,

and it does not pay one single bill. It is all symbols and no substance. Unfortunately, the media treats the entire Government like spectator sport up here, finding out who is on top, and who won this particular vote, without focusing on the long term to find out where we are headed.

Mr. President the inference I took from the comments I heard earlier was that the President was not being responsible. In fact, it is we members of the Budget Committee who have not been responsible. The law that says by April 1 the budget should be reported out of the Senate Budget Committee and by April 15 it is supposed to become law.

Here it is April 5. The Budget Committee has not even started its work on the budget resolution and, yet we are running around with tables, charts, contracts, and hoopla. All symbols, no substance; all process, no product.

In December, Mr. KASICH, chairman of the House Budget Committee, told us on "Meet the Press" that we were going to have three budgets. In addition, we were going to have spending cuts and put them in the bank before we got any tax cuts.

Mr. President, we do not have the spending cuts, but in the House today, they are voting on tax cuts. And where are the spending cuts that they promised? In January I put in the RECORD a list of spending cuts and an illustrative glide path to balance the budget by the year 2002.

(Ms. SNOWE) assumed the chair.

Mr. HOLLINGS. We computed that you had to have at least \$37 billion in cuts to put us on that glidepath of Government in the black by the year 2002.

That does not take into measure any tax cuts. You are going to lose another \$189 billion over 5 years, if the House succeeds with their tax cut. I was asked earlier this morning about the tax cut. I said, "A tax cut really means a tax increase."

They said, "That is doubletalk. What do you mean?"

I said, "You have to think it through. The first thing your Government did

this morning at 8 o'clock was go down to the bank and borrow 1 billion bucks and add it to the debt." That is interest costs. They should more appropriately be called interest taxes in that they cannot be avoided. We are adding it to the debt which is now rapidly approaching \$5 trillion bucks. Gross interest costs now total \$339 billion and, with rising interest rates, it will soon surpass \$1 billion a day.

Thus, if you care to have a tax cut for the middle class, you have in reality burdened the middle class by increasing interest taxes and driving ever skyward, the Federal debt.

The contract is a political exercise designed to make it look like we are thinking about the middle class when in reality we are depriving the middle class. You are doing it to them, not for them, when you pass that tax cut.

I cosponsored a bill earlier this year, along with the Senator from Wisconsin, saying that we oppose the tax cuts would rather any savings be used to reduce the deficit. I am glad the Senate now has gone on record to that effect.

I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point, dated January 23, the truth in budgeting proposal.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLINGS RELEASES REALITIES ON TRUTH IN BUDGETING

Reality No. 1: \$1.2 trillion in spending cuts is necessary.

Reality No. 2: There aren't enough savings in entitlements. Have welfare reform, but a jobs program will cost; savings are questionable. Health reform can and should save some, but slowing growth from 10 to 5 percent doesn't offer enough savings. Social Security won't be cut and will be off-budget again.

Reality No. 3: We should hold the line on the budget on Defense; that would be no savings.

Reality No. 4: Savings must come from freezes and cuts in domestic discretionary spending but that's not enough to stop hemorrhaging interest costs.

Reality No. 5: Taxes are necessary to stop hemorrhage in interest costs.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Deficit CBO Jan. 1995 (using trust funds)	207	224	225	253	284	297	322
Freeze discretionary outlays after 1998	0	0	0	-19	-38	-58	-78
Spending cuts	-37	-74	-111	-128	-146	-163	-180
Interest savings	-1	-5	-11	-20	-32	-46	-64
Total savings (\$1.2 trillion)	-38	-79	-122	-167	-216	-267	-322
Remaining deficit using trust funds	169	145	103	86	68	30	0
Remaining deficit excluding trust funds	287	264	222	202	185	149	121
5 percent VAT	96	155	172	184	190	196	200
Net deficit excluding trust funds	187	97	27	(17)	(54)	(111)	(159)
Gross debt	5,142	5,257	5,300	5,305	5,272	5,200	5,091
Average interest rate on debt (percent)	7.0	7.1	6.9	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.7
Interest cost on the debt	367	370	368	368	366	360	354

Note.—Figures are in billions. Figures don't include the billions necessary for a middle-class tax cut.

Nondefense discretionary spending cuts	1996	1997	Nondefense discretionary spending cuts	1996	1997	Nondefense discretionary spending cuts	1996	1997
Space station	2.1	2.1	Reduce overhead for university research	0.2	0.3	Eliminate RDA loan guarantees	0.0	0.1
Eliminate CDBG	2.0	2.0	Repeal Davis-Bacon	0.2	0.5	Eliminate Appalachian Regional Commission	0.0	0.1
Eliminate low-income home energy assistance	1.4	1.5	Reduce State Dept. funding and end misc. activities	0.1	0.2	Eliminate untargeted funds for math and science	0.1	0.2
Eliminate arts funding	1.0	1.0	End P.L. 480 title I and III sales	0.4	0.6			
Eliminate funding for campus based aid	1.4	1.4	Eliminate overseas broadcasting	0.458	0.570			
Eliminate funding for impact aid	1.0	1.0	Eliminate the Bureau of Mines	0.1	0.2			
Reduce law enforcement funding to control drugs	1.5	1.8	Eliminate expansion of rural housing assistance	0.1	0.2			
Eliminate Federal wastewater grants	0.8	1.6	Eliminate USITA	0.012	0.16			
Eliminate SBA loans	0.21	0.282	Eliminate ATP	0.1	0.2			
Reduce Federal aid for mass transit	0.5	0.1	Eliminate airport grant in aids	0.3	1.0			
Eliminate EDA	0.02	0.1	Eliminate Federal highway demonstration projects	0.1	0.3			
Reduce Federal rent subsidies	0.1	0.2	Eliminate Amtrak subsidies	0.4	0.4			

Nondefense discretionary spending cuts	1996	1997
Cut Federal salaries by 4 percent	4.0	4.0
Charge Federal employees commercial rates for parking	0.1	0.1
Reduce agricultural research extension activities	0.2	0.2
Cancel advanced solid rocket motor	0.3	0.4
Eliminate legal services	0.4	0.4
Reduce Federal travel by 30 percent	0.4	0.4
Reduce energy funding for Energy Technology Develop. ..	0.2	0.5
Reduce Superfund cleanup costs	0.2	0.4
Reduce REA subsidies	0.1	0.1
Eliminate postal subsidies for nonprofits	0.1	0.1
Reduce NIH funding	0.5	1.1
Eliminate Federal Crop Insurance Program	0.3	0.3
Reduce Justice State-local assistance grants	0.1	0.2
Reduce export-import direct loans	0.1	0.2
Eliminate library programs	0.1	0.1
Modify Service Contract Act	0.2	0.2
Eliminate HUD special purpose grants	0.2	0.3
Reduce housing programs	0.4	1.0
Eliminate Community Investment Program	0.1	0.4
Reduce Strategic Petroleum Program	0.1	0.1
Eliminate Senior Community Service Program	0.1	0.4
Reduce USDA spending for export marketing	0.02	0.02
Reduce maternal and child health grants	0.2	0.4
Close veterans hospitals	0.1	0.2
Reduce number of political employees	0.1	0.1
Reduce management costs for VA health care	0.2	0.4
Reduce PMA subsidy	0.0	1.2
Reduce below cost timber sales	0.0	0.1
Reduce the legislative branch 15 percent	0.3	0.3
Eliminate Small Business Development Centers	0.056	0.074
Eliminate minority assistance score, small business interstate and other technical assistance programs, women's business assistance, international trade as- sistance, empowerment zones	0.033	0.046
Eliminate new State Department construction projects ..	0.010	0.023
Eliminate Int'l Boundaries and Water Commission	0.013	0.02
Eliminate Asia Foundation	0.013	0.015
Eliminate International Fisheries Commission	0.015	0.015
Eliminate Arms Control Disarmament Agency	0.041	0.054
Eliminate NED	0.014	0.034
Eliminate Fulbright and other international exchanges ..	0.119	0.207
Eliminate North-South Center	0.002	0.004
Eliminate U.S. contribution to WHO, OAS, and other international organizations including the United Na- tions	0.873	0.873
Eliminate participation in U.N. peacekeeping	0.533	0.533
Eliminate Byrne grant	0.112	0.306
Eliminate Community Policing Program	0.286	0.780
Moratorium on new Federal prison construction	0.208	0.140
Reduce coast guard 10 percent	0.208	0.260
Eliminate Manufacturing Extension Program	0.03	0.06
Eliminate coastal zone management	0.03	0.06
Eliminate national Marine sanctuaries	0.007	0.012
Eliminate climate and global change research	0.047	0.078
Eliminate national sea grant	0.032	0.054
Eliminate State weather modification grant	0.002	0.003
Cut weather service operations 10 percent	0.031	0.051
Eliminate regional climate centers	0.002	0.003
Eliminate Minority Business Development Agency	0.022	0.044
Eliminate Public Telecommunications Facilities Program grant	0.003	0.016
Eliminate children's educational television	0.0	0.002
Eliminate national information infrastructure grant	0.001	0.032
Cut Pell grants 20 percent	0.250	1.24
Eliminate education research	0.042	0.283
Cut Head Start 50 percent	0.840	1.8
Eliminate meals and services for the elderly	0.335	0.473
Eliminate title II social service block grant	2.7	2.8
Eliminate community services block grant	0.317	0.470
Eliminate rehabilitation services	1.85	2.30
Eliminate vocational education	0.176	1.2
Eliminate chapter 1 20 percent	0.173	1.16
Reduce special education 20 percent	0.072	0.480
Eliminate bilingual education	0.029	0.196
Eliminate JTPA	0.250	4.5
Eliminate child welfare services	0.240	0.289
Eliminate CDC Breast Cancer Program	0.048	0.089
Eliminate CDC AIDS Control Program	0.283	0.525
Eliminate Ryan White AIDS Program	0.228	0.468
Eliminate maternal and child health	0.246	0.506
Eliminate Family Planning Program	0.069	0.143
Eliminate CDC Immunization Program	0.168	0.345
Eliminate Tuberculosis Program	0.042	0.087
Eliminate agricultural research service	0.546	0.656
Reduce WIC 50 percent	1.579	1.735
Eliminate TEFAP:		
Administrative	0.024	0.040
Commodities	0.025	0.025
Reduce cooperative State research service 20 percent ...	0.044	0.070
Reduce animal plant health inspection service 10 per- cent	0.036	0.044
Reduce food safety inspection service 10 percent	0.047	0.052
Total	36.942	58.407

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

Finally, I could not get to the floor yesterday, but I heard my distinguished colleague from Kansas, the majority leader, constantly talking about,

Well, if you want to talk about children, why didn't you think about it when we were voting for the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution? That is when you should have been thinking about children. The Democrats flip-flopped.

Well, let me correct that record. The flip-flopper is the majority leader. He

voted for my law, section 13301, of the Budget Enforcement Act, signed by President Bush on November 5, 1990. In a word, it says "Thou shalt not use Social Security funds for the deficit."

Unfortunately, I cannot find it in the newspapers. If they ever print it, I am going to give them some kind of Pulitzer Prize. I have seen magazine articles. I just saw Susan Dentzer in the U.S. News and World Report; I saw Time magazine; I have seen Newsweek. But have not seen anywhere in print that we have a law saying you cannot use Social Security funds for the deficit.

In direct conflict with that law, section 7 of the balanced budget amendment says, "On, no, all receipts and all revenues shall be used."

I cannot go in two different directions. No, I was not thinking of the children. I was thinking of the trust we made with the senior citizens.

But I am thinking of children, though, and what will happen when they begin to use those funds. When their time comes in the next century, they are going to have to be taxed a second time to get their money. And that is why I do not want that \$600 billion in Social Security funds to be used for this charade of balancing the budget.

The balanced budget amendment to the Constitution is supposed to put a gun to the head of Congress to give us discipline. Instead, it makes Congress creative.

I remember what happened during the budget summit of 1990. The leadership went out to Andrews Air Base and said, "We're going to put in caps," and the caps—well, they were way higher than this ceiling. I do not believe they ever brought them in for us to look at. All these words, charades, plays and games have to be understood for what they are.

The majority leader says that they do not intend to use Social Security funds. He said so in the debate on the floor, and others have said so.

But we know differently. If they can use \$600 billion of Social Security funds to make it look balanced, they will, in effect, only be moving the deficit from the general Government over to the Social Security fund.

I am ready to get serious. The budget was supposed to be reported out on April 1, pass both Houses and be sent to the President by April 15.

So let us not come on the floor of the Senate and chastise the President of the United States for being guilty of a crime that he did not commit. We cannot in good conscience continue this game against the White House.

I can tell you, nothing is going to happen around here because I am going to start joining in this game. I was not going to come to the floor today. I did not feel so kindly toward the executive branch because we had worked, the Republicans and Democrats from both sides of the aisle, on a very complicated telecommunications bill. We reported it out with 8 of the 10 Repub-

licans approving it. We got it out with all nine of the Democrats approving it. We had a bipartisan bill reported out of the Commerce Committee last week. We were ready to go this week. But then along comes the Vice President and says he does not like the provisions in the bill about cable TV. There are a lot of things I don't feel totally comfortable with, but this bill is a bipartisan compromise bill. A compromise between the Republican bill and the Democratic bill that reflects a lot of give-and-take. Overall this bill is good for the public. The Republicans wanted to totally deregulate the upper tiers, the Democrats did not let them. We still have the basic tier regulated. We did the best we could do with the votes we had in committee. Another example where we had to compromise was on the question of RBOC entry into long distance. We still have the Department of Justice in a consultative role. I can go down point by point where the Democrats would have supported a stronger position. Just look at the Democratic draft of February 15. But my reaction this morning when I read the paper about the administration's position reminds me of the story when Churchill was talking to Stalin about the Soviet troops going into East Poland and how the Pope was worried about it. And Stalin is reported to have asked: "How many divisions does the Pope have?"

This morning my question was, how many votes does the Vice President have? We know the votes pretty well, and I can tell you the votes weren't there in committee. We have a bill we could have passed in a bipartisan fashion here in 2, maybe 3 days, like we had planned. The committee reported out a similar bill, S. 1822, by a vote of 18 to 2 last year. We reported it out 18 to 2. I support Senator PRESSLER's bill.

When we get to the floor, there will be some amendments. But when the executive branch says "veto"—I hear now the Vice President said he did not say "veto"—it sends a very conflicting signal. I asked the distinguished chairman of our Commerce Committee this morning, "Larry, did he say veto?" He said he used the word five times. So I asked my staff and they said that the administration would veto the communications bill in its current form.

So if they are going to veto it, then I feel sort of relieved of my further responsibility of trying to maintain the core provisions of the bill. I was very fearful we might get rolled on the amendments, such as a date-certain entry on long distance. If that passed, then there would be no so-called level playing field. There would be no competition test, and you would have the RBOC's moving in and extending their monopoly rather than real competition in the local exchange. And bet your boots the RBOC's have the clout to do it.

In the middle of all this criticism of the committee, we can at least be

thankful to the heads of AmeriTech, AT&T, the Justice Department, and particularly Anne Bingaman, the Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust.

That is not the case at all. That lady is an astute trial lawyer. She knows her subject and works around the clock and has been working for months on getting this so-called consent presentation to Judge Greene.

I say kudos to Anne Bingaman; the president of AmeriTech; to Bob Laland, the president of AT&T; and I think it was the fellow from the Consumer Federation of America.

The four appeared on television the day before yesterday. What they had was a proposal. They proposed that they move forward, and they had the steps and we looked at our bill. We looked at the steps and they are one and the same.

Why should we delay and palaver on the floor of the Congress when the parties in the particular discipline have all agreed?

Long distance, ARBOCK, Justice Department, Consumer Federation, have all gotten together. We had a real good kickoff. I am particularly indebted to those parties, and particularly the Deputy Attorney General, and to the Department of Justice, in charge of the antitrust.

I see other Senators wishing to be recognized. I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICA'S SENSITIVE NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY

Mr. GLENN. Madam President and colleagues, I rise to speak briefly today about a rather curious development in the history of U.S. efforts to halt the global spread of nuclear weapons.

The hallmark of a good law is its ability to balance elements of permanence and change. A good law offers both fixed compass points and sufficient latitude for tactical navigation.

Our nonproliferation legislation offers no exception to this rule. When our laws and policies apply too much sail or too much anchor, the consequences can be devastating for vital national security interests of the United States.

For example, the notion of timely warning—that is, a legal precondition for certain forms of nuclear cooperation that was placed into the Atomic Energy Act to ensure stringent controls over exported U.S. nuclear materials and technology—has been rendered virtually meaningless by the way various administrations have used this term over the last decade to expedite

commercial uses of U.S.-controlled plutonium in other countries.

United States nuclear cooperation with Japan and with members of EURATOM, the European Atomic Energy Community, a region plagued by daily headlines of new black market nuclear deals, are two specific cases where large-scale nuclear cooperation is proceeding without timely warning having been satisfied within the original meaning of the term.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks an authoritative interpretation of this concept by Dr. Leonard Weiss, who is now the minority staff director of the Governmental Affairs Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GLENN. Another example, Madam President, in 1985, following repeated and flagrant violations of its peaceful nuclear assurances to the United States, Pakistan was required by the Pressler amendment to satisfy a certification requirement before receiving new aid. Specifically, the President had to certify that Pakistan did not possess a nuclear explosive device and that new aid would, as numerous officials from the Reagan administration had asserted, reduce significantly the risk that Pakistan would acquire such a device.

America funneled hundreds of millions of United States taxpayer dollars into Pakistan after 1985, until President Bush finally stopped making the required certifications in 1990.

Throughout that period, both Presidents Reagan and Bush solemnly certified—using an interpretation of the word “possess” that would make even the most cynical of our Government’s legal advisors blush—that Pakistan did not possess the bomb.

The interpretations of the words “reduce” and “significantly” were similarly handled, as though they had been inscribed on something like silly putty. They did not mean anything.

Since the aid cutoff in 1990, by the way, we have finally started to see the first signs of some potential nuclear restraint in Pakistan in the form of a freeze on the production of highly enriched uranium.

Oh yes, I almost forgot to mention the \$1 billion or so in taxpayer dollars not doled out to Pakistan since 1990 in the name of restraining Pakistan’s bomb program. Those funds remain here at home, thanks to the Pressler amendment.

As a footnote to the sad saga of Washington’s failure to implement the Pressler sanctions until 1990, however, our Government has since interpreted the ban on assistance as not covering commercial sales of military equipment, including spare parts for Pakistan’s nuclear weapon delivery vehicle, the F-16. Even joint military exercises are not regarded as assistance. Once

again, a key nonproliferation term has been molded and distorted beyond recognition.

Yet, my remarks today will focus on another term that has found its way into the “Twilight Zone” of nonproliferation. I am referring to the term “sensitive nuclear technology,” SNT, as it is known, which the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act very clearly defines as any information, other than restricted data, “* * * which is not available to the public and which is important to the design, construction, fabrication, operation or maintenance of a uranium enrichment or nuclear fuel reprocessing facility or a facility for the production of heavy water * * *”.

If we look carefully into the United States-Japan agreement for nuclear cooperation, signed in 1987, we will find a clause in there that says the following: “* * * sensitive nuclear technology shall not be transferred under this Agreement.” That is article 2-1-b.

Underscoring this provision, the principal negotiator of this agreement, Ambassador Richard Kennedy, testified on December 16, 1987, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee: “The transfer of restricted data and sensitive nuclear technology under the agreement is specifically excluded.”

Last September, the international environmental group, Greenpeace, prepared a lengthy analysis of the transfers of United States nuclear reprocessing technology to Japan. This study, titled “The Unlawful Plutonium Alliance: Japan’s Supergrade Plutonium and the Role of the United States,” makes for interesting reading. It presents considerable evidence of United States cooperation with Japan in the areas of plutonium breeder reactors and nuclear fuel reprocessing.

On September 8, 1994, the United States Department of Energy promised a comprehensive review of the report and further stated that it was “phasing out collaborative research efforts with Japan on plutonium reprocessing and development of breeder reactor technology.”

The same day, the New York Times quoted a Department of Energy spokesman as saying that this cooperation was “* * * a remnant of the last administration.”

Later, on September 23, Greenpeace was joined by the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Nuclear Control Institute in demanding several steps to restore United States-Japan nuclear cooperation to the constraints of United States law.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter by these organizations to Energy Secretary Hazel O’Leary.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL; NUCLEAR CONTROL INSTITUTE; NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL,